

1 2 Citizen/Outreach Committee Meeting 3 4 5 6 Monday, January 12, 2004 2:00 p.m. 7th & Franklin Building Richmond, Virginia 23219 7 8 9 **APPEARANCES** 10 H. Ronnie Montgomery, Chairman Claude B. Owen, Jr., Vice-Chairman 11 12 Thomas W. Arthur 13 Clarence D. Bryant, III 14 Fred M. Fields 15 Harrison A. Moody **Edward Owens** 16 17 John M. Stallard 18 John T. Taylor 19 The Honorable Mary Sue Terry 20 The Honorable Gary D. Walker 21 **Commission Staff** Carthan F. Currin, III, Executive Director 22 23 Tim Pfohl; Grants Program Administration Manager 24 Britt Nelson, Grants Coordinator - Southside Virginia 25 Attorney General's Office 26 Anne Marie Cushmac, Senior Assistant Attorney General

 $\overline{28}$

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

MR. MONTGOMERY: I want to welcome everyone to our meeting today. Carthan is handing out a letter that I want everyone to take a look at. You need to call roll Carthan?

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Arthur?
MR. ARTHUR: Here.
MR. CURRIN: Mr. Bryant?
MR. BRYANT: Here.
MR. CURRIN: Mr. Fields?
MR. FIELDS: Here.

WIK. FIELDS. Hele.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Moody?

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC. 4914 Fitzhugh Avenue, Suite 203 Richmond, Virginia 23230 Tel. No. (804) 355-4335

MR. MOODY: Here. MR. CURRIN: Mr. Owen?

MR. OWEN: Here.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Owens?

MR. OWENS: Here.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Stallard? MR. STALLARD: Here. MR. CURRIN: Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Here.

MR. CURRIN: Ms. Terry?

MR. TERRY: Here.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Walker?

MR. WALKER: Here.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Chairman? MR. MONTGOMERY: Here. MR. CURRIN: Mr. Thompson? MR. THOMPSON: (No response) MR. CURRIN: You have a quorum.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Then we can proceed.

MR. CURRIN: I'm having this letter handed out to you that was sent out earlier so if you didn't bring it you'll have it here again with you. In your packets also and the staff prepared this for you and it's on our website. In here there's also some information on programs in North Carolina and Kentucky. To some degree, both of those states have tobacco programs that are funded as we are through the master settlement agreement and I thought that would be of interest to you. In addition, there are copies of all the application instructions to each of the committees that are currently in place right now and they're in your packet as well. Since we're discussing this process and the framework, I thought that would be helpful to have that as a reference as we deliberate here this afternoon.

For some of the new Commission members, you all may recall the current Commission was created by the General Assembly in 1999 and I was appointed in November of 1999 and given the statute it basically said good luck. There was no basic framework in place as those of you that were on the Commission in the early days remember. The committee process evolved accordingly along with the full Commission. When we started, we had two economic committees; one for Southside and one for Southwest. Earlier on in fiscal year 2000, we had several projects come to our attention and it was felt by the Commission at that time that a special projects committee should be created to address issues like Crop Tech or Virginia Tech Bioinformatics Program and projects that span both regions and there were different than normal type economic development requests that would come before the Commission.

Currently we have 12 committees that comprise the Commission. For a body as large and diverse as we are and if you look at the proposed funding allocations and the long-range plan, you'll see how the Commission is structured and how the committees answer to the planning and strategies in that plan. I think the committee structure currently in place reflects adequately what the Governor's charge to us was when we created the long-range plan. Through the committee structure, staff has worked to build a stronger and more robust grant application process. Some of these committees are more active than others. There's the Personnel Committee, the Procurement Committee, they do not meet that frequently and others are much more active. Southwest, Special Projects, Southside,

Agribusiness, Education, Technology all have dollars associated with those committees through the Commission in the budgetary process. Also just as a reminder, to date all the committees that have funding responsibilities have an application process associated with those committees except technology. That's something we need to have in place. It hasn't been as necessary because we already knew our major initiatives in Southwest and Southside but as other things crop up in that subject of technology, we need a process that you all are comfortable with and can support.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Is the Long Range Planning Committee still active?
MR. CURRIN: Yes, it's not been active but Delegate Byron chairs that committee. I recommended to the Chairman that after the long range task force did its business and submitted the long range plan we have in place now, we still needed something to continue to work with a living document because as you all have charged us, a long range plan after it's completed that should not be the end of it. If you want to make it effective, things change and it may have to change. So that's why that is there.

As I understand it, the Chairman's charge to this Citizen Outreach Committee is to look at a process and how the Commission addresses its funding request for example. To ensure that the requests are given enough time and consideration based on merit and to enhance the grant review process so we can best serve both regions.

The process is obviously important and we are a public body charged with a very significant responsibility by the General Assembly of Virginia. This Commission has been charged with funding allocations that represents the 34 counties and seven cities. To quote Secretary Schewel as we talk about the process and due diligence, we must be mindful of bureaucratic creep. Those of us that have served in government know all to well that can sometimes enter the process.

The Committee has several issues to explore and many questions to try to answer and here are a few examples of what may come out of this meeting this afternoon. How can we streamline our process that's currently in place, should we establish set times for turnaround processes within each committee as we have for our Economic Development Committees, should the Commission limit the type of projects from which we will accept applications in a given year, should each committee focus on their efforts on one main issue per year, and should we make changes on how we fund or what we fund?

Beginning in fiscal year 2004 we were committing more funding and grants than in the past years. This boost in resources translates to an increased responsibility and accountability for the Commission and the Commission staff. With more grant funds, staff will have more site visits and review a greater amount of information. In the long term, this means working with more organizations and more communities for future requests for Commission dollars. It's important we have a staff to handle the added responsibilities that we're taking on.

With this in mind, the Governor for one and this Commission has agreed to fund and support a position of manager of strategic investments. This person will help develop, implement, process in order to create a foundation or to enhance the foundation we have for a sustainable economic development and growth in both regions. To further our economic development needs to seek a partnership with other entities in Virginia, which we have been doing, organizations for that matter and some of our neighboring states.

I'm working currently with the Governor's office and the chairman to have this Commission potentially enter into a conference hosted by us and we will also have North Carolina and Kentucky as participants to look at best practices of tobacco funds in our three states. Along with this I believe strongly and I've talked to other members of the

Commission who feel as strong as I do that at some point this year, this Commission should engage in a long-range strategic retreat somewhere in our regions. My staff will be communicating with you all on suggestions and ideas. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'd like to add that as a recommendation for this committee to consider to the full Commission.

In conclusion, my recommendations to the Citizen Outreach Committee is to work to find ways to streamline our application process and encourage communities to cooperate with one another to capitalize on their individual strengths. In my view, the Commission needs to act more aggressively and to communicate to local governments that they must cooperate with each other if they want to utilize our funds. We must strongly suggest to them to work together and to knock down walls of colloquialisms that we sometimes have to face in this Commission. As you work to achieve these goals, I urge you to remember the words of Henry Ford who said "coming together is a beginning, keeping together is progress and working together is success." Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. MONTGOMERY: This letter we sent out January 12th, most of you probably got it before but Mr. Fields said he didn't get it. I guess as a starting point what I'd like to do is open this up for discussion and let committee members state their frank feelings about what we're doing right and what we should be doing if we're not doing something and as far as I'm concerned, everything is open for discussion. Mr. Claude Owens is the Vice-Chairman, you have any feeling about what you'd like the Committee to do?

MR. OWEN: No, I think the mandate that the Commission chairman and you as the committee chairman have laid out is very appropriate.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to see us take a look at our different scheduled dates for funding in our areas like in the Southside Economic Development Funding and the Education Funding and I'd like to stop right there with education. I'd like to see these dates changed to help staff as well as help us. This past one we had on January 8th, we had something like 45 applications for \$23 million and we had only \$2.4 million and so I'd like to let us take a good look at our education guidelines and also our dates.

MR. MONTGOMERY: The thing that concerns me since I've been on the Commission going on five years now is that our charge was the revitalize the economy. That's easier said than done. I'd like to hear your feelings and ideas about how you think we can do that in the two tobacco regions. I'll open the floor for discussion or we could start going around helter skelter if you want too.

MR. MOODY: I agree with Mr. Taylor that the education grants we had, we had a lot of grants and very little money to work with. I think education is very important to revitalize the economy. If you can get people educated then that goes a long way to getting the economy going.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, along those lines, I'm not on the education committee but we received that material. I read through as many of them as I could and so many of those applications cross over into other areas. The workforce development, the Workforce Investment Board and literally millions of dollars that those people have access to other than tobacco funds. Some people that apply to us, the only hope they have of getting a grant is to get something from the Tobacco Commission. I don't know if it's right or wrong but when they've got another big pot of money. Workforce development money, I've served on the Workforce Investment Board in our region for many years and they probably have more money available to them than we do with the Tobacco Commission. Then they come in to the tobacco pot of money trying to and I'm not sure if we granted that but at least are applying to take money out of the tobacco funding to an area that already has money designated to them. They had at least two grant applications from the State of

Virginia Department of Education. Certainly they had more money available to them than the Tobacco Commission.

MR. OWENS: Does the staff have available to them a mechanism of other potential matches for grants to refer people to?

MR. CURRIN: Yes Mr. Owens, in fact I'm pleased to report to you that in this particular cycle in that application process we require to have in place language that says do you have other sources of funding part of that. Yes, we work and know about and in fact Secretary Schewel has been complimentary of staff's recommendations to the committee taking those issues and evaluating them. I think the committee has done a very good job in streamlining a lot of those requests and did not meet and working in a comprehensive way with others. We approved and I'm not sure what the exact number was, \$1.6 million \$2.2, we left approximately \$600,000 to be allocated at a future date. From the staff's perspective, I would say, I don't know the exact percentage but it was a strong grouping that we said no to or you need to change it in order to get our support.

MR. OWENS: We can use that money to leverage.

MR. CURRIN: Absolutely, what you all mandated toward us to keep in mind.

MS. TERRY: Leverage is not leverage if they already have other money. Leverage is only leverage if they can't get the money.

MR. CURRIN: We had one that was \$8 million and one was \$5 million and we only had \$2.2. Right now talking about education that's a pretty good subject. We have everything from supporting an MBA Program and a four-year college in Southside and we now have a public school in Farmville, Virginia through workforce development issues, to GED. There was a wide range of alphabet requests and we find that in other committees as well. I don't know if that's something that this committee Mr. Chairman wants to suggest. At some point say on the Education Committee, the Education Committee will tell the outside world that we're going to focus on GED resources and that's it and nothing else will be accepted. I guess that's one way to help streamline that process. The flip side of that is that you are excluding other potential worthy requests that may have a different slant but still educated related.

MS. TERRY: This is just a thought that occurred to me, I'm not an Education Committee member but the Commission might think of itself as an entity to leverage fund dollars. For example, the Education Committee would decide that it would really be a powerful thing for years and then the Commission were to make grant applications to the Kellogg Foundation, Ford Foundation or other foundations, and say we've identified there are needs and we're prepared to allocate these dollars but it's going to take this to get there. The Commission sought grant money at the Commission level and other monies at the Commission level as opposed to leaving it to the localities. We're kind of doing that in the technology area, we're leveraging Commission dollars with federal dollars. I'm wondering that if you take a couple of million dollars and identify a theme, that couple of million dollars might be multiplied several times and the Commission go from there down to the locality.

MR. OWENS: Would that work in economic development if we had money or whatever?

MR. CURRIN: Ms. Terry's right, I made an attempt a year ago and wrote 50 foundations regional and national and I was very clear in my letter I thought. What I was trying to suggest was a leveraging opportunity. Most of the foundations thought I was asking them for money and I have done some follow up to suggest that's not the case but

she's right, there's a tremendous amount of money nationally and regionally that I feel we very much should try to leverage. That's just with the foundation committee. It seems to me Mr. Chairman that maybe some of our universities that are in our regions, Virginia Tech which we supported. They have grant writers on staff and it seems to me maybe they could add some assistance to help us open some doors.

MS. TERRY: Let me throw out one idea and I consult with a high tech software maker but I'm not pushing software makers products but I know they make grants in situations where there's opportunities. I think the theme this year has to do with expanding the use and access of computers. One of the things I was wondering was if, for example, on the Southside basis if we were to look at developing partnerships between some public schools, the computer labs in the schools and then in turn using the schools for the adult education labs or GED training at night and we develop a strategic plan where GED training and maybe certification and computer certificates, some things to be operated on a school base basis and tie that in which would involve the need for software and maybe some other needs. I think that could be an interesting concept that would energize and motivate people and multiple uses of building space. In rural areas, people have to drive a long way and in Patrick you've got to drive 30 miles to come to a program. If we could be on the cutting edge out there on a regional wide basis or at least thinking on a regional wide basis about opening some of our schools at night and have broad base stuff in the schools making use of the building, it could be an interesting idea. I don't know if anybody else is doing it. It could be an interesting opportunity for a grant application to the national entity and we're focusing on a broad base level that upgrades computer skills should be something that would be interesting to see what would happen as well as GED and as well as the computer certification programs.

MR. PFOHL: Mr. Chairman, if I could add a note of response to Mr. Owens question. On the topic of other sources of funding, Ms. Pack, our assistant, generated a tremendous list of other sources of education funding alone. The education reviewers looked at it before we started reading the applications. So there clearly is a tremendous amount of money out there and how well it's coordinated probably is the real issue. That's an issue not only with the education grants but with economic development and workforce training and some other issues that we have involvement in. Given the range of the education requests alone and the range of things that came before us from basic education to workforce development, to masters degree level programs and other programs and so forth, it's a daunting task to understand what resources are out there. I think there's resources that are specific to each one of those fields. To remind folks that the long-range plan did call for program officers that would have expertise in areas such as education or economic development and so forth. In the interim, what we were trying to do in reviewing the grants and involvement of reviewers that had backgrounds in the education fields and when we go through economic development grants, have reviewers that have a background in various aspects of economic development. I think that's helped us tremendously in understanding what other sources are out there with some of these grants. Having more clarity as far as what are the things that the Commission wants to be involved in I think would be very helpful to the grant staff as we review these requests.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Chairman, if I may echo one point. I meant to bring this up in my formal comments. I have recommended to the Secretary and he has agreed to do this, that once we have in place the director of strategic investments that one of the first things I'd like that person to deal with is to help the Secretary, and he's agreed to hosting a meeting to have all the state agencies and the federal partners that currently have monies

going to Southwest and Southside Virginia. My intent or our intent was to really focus on how much is going to these two regions and in my view, how little coordinated it is. It's a big concern of mine. On the state level alone we've got the Department of Community and Housing Development, you've got the Department of Business Assistance, you've got the Virginia Economic Development Partnership, you've got the Department of Agriculture and that comes to mind immediately. The Virginia Employment Commission with the WIA Federal Program. There's about a half a dozen state agencies involving millions of dollars pouring into these regions and we've got millions of dollars and then you've got the federal You've got the Economic Development Agency, U.S. Department of government. Agriculture, U.S.D.A. I think at the Secretarial level and if Mike would host it, he said he would love to do it, we could then start meeting and really getting focused on what you said Mr. Owens and it's a darn good point. Where this money is going, who's talking to who, who should be talking to who and make sure we're leveraging just at the federal and state level. That's something I'll be working closely on with our new director of strategic investments and that's an important thing we need to do.

I had one federal agency head tell me that in 20 years in office, he had one call from the Secretary of Commerce in the Commonwealth of Virginia and most of this person's money goes to rural Virginia. That told me something that we needed to coordinate and jumpstart in discussing where all this money is going, how it could be better coordinated.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Have we been putting our money where the Committee thinks it should go or is there a better place that we can put money that's not available anywhere. Sometimes some of these projects that we approve I find questionable really.

MR. OWENS: Can we take a look at the communities, those communities that are applying for the money know the needs, where that economic impact would be?

MR. CURRIN: Yes, sir, basically. We're trusting for the most part though.

MR. TAYLOR: I think most of them come through the IDA.

MR. OWENS: But not for education funding. The charge of the Commission is to go through education and economic development and industrial development, improve economic conditions in Southside and Southwest, Virginia.

MR. MONTGOMERY: It's to revitalize the economy and it really doesn't say much about education.

MR. OWENS: But education is key to it, right?

MR. MONTGOMERY: That's debatable, it may be and it may not be.

MR. WALKER: If the state spends \$16 million dollars on it and we throw in a couple of million on top of that, does it really hit the pot? As much money as we spend on education and the federal government and put a little more that we add to the pot, is it really going to make a difference?

MR. TAYLOR: Does the state break down their funding so that each locality will know what's coming into that area? Do they break it down to the point of GED and all this?

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Taylor, you bring up a point and Ms. Terry brought up something to me and that is where are the localities and how much more can they come up with to support on the initiatives they're asking us to support, what is their ability to do more than they really are maybe doing. That's something we need to look at, capacity to do more.

MS. TERRY: The effort the localities are making.

MR. OWEN: Mr. Chairman, the comment on what you just said, are we

spending the money or sending the money to the right place? I applaud Carthan's suggestion that the Commission have a planning retreat. I think the process in which our long-range plan was developed, presented and approved is not a pro-active very interactive process by the Commission. It was sort of a separate committee doing it it on a snowy evening when a bear majority of the Commission was present at the John Marshall Hotel and it was approved. I don't think either before that or after that has a lot of attention been made to the priorities set in the long-range plan. I think the Commission needs to revisit the plan to examine whether those are in fact or should be our priorities and if they are, have a buy in and then everything from our committee structure to our spending policy be to further those goals and objectives. I believe on the spending side, we have to hope that all the improvements and processes that we are, including the new hire that we're bringing on, proposing to bring on that will get better at making those selective choices for the limited dollars. Somehow it seems to me that we should be, that we ought to be guided by a word like transformation. Doing more of the same in the communities I'm not sure is the right answer. More business parks, more business incubators, more water and sewer. I do sometimes question Ed, a lot of these economic development strategies that come forward from the communities and it's sort of intra region or intra community competition, trying to get that warehouse or distribution center or call center which is still relatively mobile and low paying jobs. As soon as they can do it cheaper in India, those jobs will be gone. It seems to me our limited resources would be best spent if we could find those transformational projects and strategies that might bring a change. I think we more than ever have the attention of the state government, both the Governor and the legislators about our region needing help. I think some of the things they're willing to do in terms of education dollars for example would play into this strategy of transformation.

MR. TAYLOR: Something you might be thinking about but I think something we should think about is tourism.

MR. OWEN: Yes, I think we really need to be thinking about those things that really make a big bang. In education, and just as an anecdote, I was on the treadmill where they shoot this fluid into you and got talking about this labor issue and it turned out that my nurse who was running that very sophisticated equipment, I'm sure a pretty good paying job, lost her job as a cork cutter at Pillowtex. In some way, shape or form with government assistance, she went back and got retrained and now has this good job. To me that's a well spent investment, perhaps more than just some other strategies on how to spend our education dollars. I'm sort of biased and just sort of looking at things that can make a major difference rather than those marginal things, keep us on the fringe competitively that will probably lose that competitive advantage not far down the road anyway.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, following up on what he just said. The key for that lady was that she had a job. We got people with GEDs and PhDs but they don't have a job and that's why I think we've got to focus. Educating everybody is a great thing but we've got to focus on the job aspect of it no matter what amount of education, we've got to have some jobs for them to go to so they can make a living. Bringing these jobs into Southwest and Southside, Virginia is the most important thing we can do.

MR. MONTGOMERY: We've been educating people out our way and they're moving out to Indiana and Michigan and Maryland and other places.

MR. OWENS: Well it's the chicken and the egg thing. If you don't have a willing and educated workforce, you're not going to recruit a strong and long lasting industry. It's not going to happen. If they're looking in an area that has a well educated workforce, a willing workforce to relocate and then look at Southside, Virginia which the

education level is not that high, they're going to more likely all things being the same, go where the people have the highest level of education and give those people a better quality of life. How do you attract new industry to a place that can't offer these things?

MR. FIELDS: If you don't educate them, they're not going to work. Which comes first, the chicken or the egg? We certainly don't want them shooting the dye into Claude if they're not educated to do that.

MR. OWEN: Even the notion of industrial recruitment in getting jobs, that's not the game it used to be. People are not building plants, manufacturers in this country are not building plants and relocating plants like they used to and if they do, it's probably overseas, where they contract it out to somebody overseas. Even the notion about where new jobs are going to come from probably needs a bit of rethinking. It's small business, entrepreneurs, tourism and different kind of efforts than just recruiting a manufacturing plant to our region.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, that goes back to what Senator Hawkins keeps repeating over and over again about local ownership. We've got to have people that have the incentive and the know how and we can go out and help them. We've done it several times in this Commission. Some of our best success stories have been home grown people that had an idea and we've helped them get started. Those are the things we're proudest of. Those are the people that want to stay here.

MS. TERRY: Just to follow up on what you're saying and a number of you have said, when those who were part of the Search Committee in that process and some very capable people were introduced, one of the people talked about entrepreneurship in North Carolina and some of the things that some of us, including myself might have laughed at which is jams and jellies and developing multi-million dollar industries out of cottages and homes helping with job creation. I know in Patrick and some of these crossroad communities, I know that some businesses have closed down. I went through there the other day there was a sold sign on some houses and a couple from Florida came up and bought two houses and they own 250 apartments in Florida and she wants to do a business there in Critz. She needs to be able to take a download of all that stuff in Florida to be able to do her business in Critz. You can't take a download and you can't make a cell phone call. This woman and her husband have the capacity to create a number of jobs in the community because they are entrepreneurs, self-made and everything. The technology infrastructure that hopefully we're in the process of building will give people an opportunity to do that. Also, and I don't know if we can get our arms around this and the economic development director of Patrick was here, we had a strategic planning routine and one of the big things was promoting entrepreneurship and we don't know how to do it. Job creation because the people in Patrick, there's people in Patrick with money but don't know how to do it. That type of thing would bring in jobs but self-promotion and how to create jobs. Nobody knows better than we do about getting people who can create jobs.

MR. MONTGOMERY: In Blacksburg the thing that surprised them was how many jobs were created by Cottage Industries that they were not anticipating. I think that sort of fits in with what you've been talking about. If you've got that high tech capacity and the bandwidth and so forth, it's surprising the people that are coming into Lee County and we've had a couple of retired folks from New Jersey recently and the lady grew up in Williamsburg and her husband is from Jamaica. We've got people from Vermont that bought a house down there. Just look around and people are coming in from everywhere and a lot of them are retirees.

MS. TERRY: The other 25 percent, we've had some from Michigan come

here and other places and they have money and they want to make a difference and create wealth.

I think your foundation question on how do we revitalize the economy is the foundational question, I think everything else flows from that question. That's certainly the foundational question, economic development and how we keep the economy going.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Montgomery, one of the things that he mentioned as an initiative which has been an issue could be one of those niches to address are concerns of retirement, being in an area where retirees want to come and locate and we've talked about that before. We have a study that's been done on that subject and I understand close to being completed and that will be reported at our May meeting. You and the committee will have an opportunity to see the report before then and that will give suggestions and recommendations on how we can position ourselves to be more attractive or get the word out that we are interested in having those kind of folks to come to our communities.

MR. MONTGOMERY: You know the rebound or risqué Yankee that goes south and then they come back to North Carolina. They're getting in the Ashville area in western North Carolina and it's getting crowded and they're looking for other places to go to as I understand it and a lot of them aren't staying in Florida. Like Yogi said, it's too crowded and nobody goes there anymore. There's something to be said for that, it's hard to get your arms around it. They bring a lot of money into an area. There's pockets of places around lakes and mountain resorts and places that are very attractive to both regions I think.

MS. TERRY: If someone wanted to do small farming, I talked to a number of people about it and Tech is an expert on beef cattle but as I understand it, if you want to look at meat goats which is a very, which there is a market for it or, I know a person that has gone into sheep and they can make more money on it. We don't have the expertise on it but I understand the expertise is in Petersburg at Virginia State. They call themselves lifestyle entrepreneurs, some people have already made their money and they'll build a pasture or small barn and they'll put something in it.

MR. MONTGOMERY: They have to have money to start with.

MS. TERRY: In fact in Scott County -

MR. CURRIN: We helped support that.

MS. TERRY: Dr. Redwine, I know in Patrick in particular was an interest in having some expertise, somebody that you can turn to that knows about sheep and goats, particularly now with the cattle situation being the way it is.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I'm a fairly good size farmer and majored in agriculture economics at Tech and then went to law school.

MR. OWEN: You're going to keep farming until it's all gone.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I'm not against putting money into agriculture but I think you have to be very careful because we're getting less and less workers in agriculture doing more and more. We're getting more efficient and we're less than two percent of the population nationwide. It's hard for people in Southwest Virginia to compete with the Midwest.

MS. TERRY: I'm not talking about finding somebody to breed stock, I'm talking about folks having easy access to the expertise because I think a lot of these folks want something like 40 acres of pasture and an old house. It's just the lifestyle and they'd buy things from feed stores and its non-money making entrepreneurs generating some work. There's no way unless you're really resourceful and drive to Scott County and meet Dr. Redwine. We don't have any expertise. The expertise is not at Virginia Tech anyway, the expertise in our area is in Virginia State.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I think the extension has helped quite a bit and I know those folks. Somebody at the extension got them started and John probably knows more about that than anybody. You know Dr. Redwine.

MR. STALLARD: Sure, I've known him all my life and we grew up together. You're talking about his hair sheep project I guess. He's a brilliant type guy. He probably makes more money off the sheep dogs he sells farmers than he does off the meat he sells from the sheep. He understands how things tend to snowball. Selling the sheep and then selling the dogs and they buy the feed at the co-op. It's a niche market for the sheep at the same time promoted with the 4-H Clubs and it's good for children. It's a good niche market and he'll be doing more of the same.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Those niche things is what I think Mary Sue's talking about. There are entrepreneur people like that.

MR. STALLARD: He's concerned with using the natural resources and that's one thing we really need to look at.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Chairman, if I may make a suggestion, we'll be meeting in February and it might be helpful for us to try to attract a facilitator to work with us as we proceed. I have a selfish reason for suggesting that because I think it would be helpful for us and then we would have a new director of strategic investments on board and that person is going to be very busy dealing with a lot of issues. I think a facilitator would help us because we're talking about a lot of serious issues. Trying to get our arms around that is not easy and I can attest to that. I think a facilitator would help focus our efforts of this committee to get solutions and recommendations on the table. The selfish thing for me is that it would help me prepare for the long term for having a strategic retreat for the full Commission. We could use this as a microcosm of how we could lead up to that meeting because we've got 31 people. That's a large group to try to get focused on different issues.

The second part to my suggestion would be, if it's okay with you and the committee, between now and the February meeting and early February is when the Chairman suggested we meet again. In the meantime maybe you all could email me ideas and other things and I'd start trying to put that in a framework document that I could give and convey to a facilitator which will help us lead those discussions and we could start getting to some point that you all wanted to do and I think that's the charge. But that's a suggestion to try to move things along and get around issues.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I think that's fine and that's a good idea. Are we talking about the 2^{nd} of February?

MR. CURRIN: Yes, sir.

MR. MONTGOMERY: We probably will need a couple of more meetings between now and the May meeting but not anymore than we have to but how does the 2^{nd} of February which is a Monday, here in Richmond. Does anyone have a conflict with a February 2^{nd} meeting?

MR. CURRIN: February 2nd is a Monday.

MR. MONTGOMERY: One other thing I want to see what you all think about it, sometimes some of these projects and I'm not an elected member of the House or Senate. Sometimes I wonder if some of these projects aren't guided by a political eye on the electorate and should we address that or how can we, or do you want to talk about it.

MR. TAYLOR: What are you saying Ronnie, do you want to take the pork barrel out of it, is that what you're saying? Isn't that the bare facts of what we're talking about here?

MR. MONTGOMERY: I'm not sure that's going to revitalize our economy

if we go with the pork barrel or stay with it. I'm not saying all of them are pork barrel but I know out our way we've had one or two that, some of the lay people on the committee were too hot on frankly.

MR. CURRIN: I think the chairman gave you full latitude to make recommendations you want to make. Let's be candid, you have ten legislators on the Commission to represent the two regions. Of course, depending on how you slice it, but I'll say yes, I think we've had some pork that we have funded, no question about it. We are a political subdivision of Virginia and political is sometimes the operative word. I think we have to be realistic that that's not going to be changed completely.

MR. OWEN: I'm speaking for special projects and economic development. When a project comes up in the Southwest, all we can do as a member of Commission and we know so little information about it, sort of really relying on the people that you trust. We look to these officials like Senator Puckett or Delegate Kilgore to say yes, it's a good project for our community so we go along with it because it's up through their area.

MR. CURRIN: I'll be honest with you if we're going to put it all on the table here. I have in the past and my staff, if so and so from County X who is head of economic development for that county don't like what we say, they call Senator X or Delegate X and they call Carthan X and I get the old, and I'm sure Mary Sue knows from her experience how she, I think you can appreciate my situation. For the most part, I have a good working relationship with members of the House and Senate and both parties and I try to, with the assistance of the Attorney General's office from time to time, sometimes this is not the right direction but those things happen. Local governments are just as bad as the legislators are at times but when they want something it happens all the time. They'll want to go around the process.

MS. TERRY: I'm not crazy about the lobbying at the cocktail parties. When we have receptions and meetings it's one thing to be involved in meeting the people which I think is wonderful to meet with people in the community but I'm not keen the lobbying that goes on which really wouldn't be needed unless you're trying to override someone. Some of it to me is just obscene. Not most of it but some of it. The question is ultimately, what kind of board are we going to be. Are we more like an Appropriations Committee or Board of Visitors from Virginia Tech or are we like the Board of Health? What kind of board are we? What culture do we aspire to have as a committee?

MR. CURRIN: Good question.

MS. TERRY: When I first came here, I think it was more like the General Assembly in terms of not having adequate notice of meetings sometimes, meetings in violation of the Freedom of Information Act which happened recently with one of our subcommittees. I think we can set the type of culture. Then there are issues as to, there are 11 General Assembly members and 20 of us. If in the heart of hearts and I'm not saying, if in the heart of hearts we believe that there should be fewer legislative members and I think we ought to have the courage to say that and have some alternative structure. We're citizens of the Commonwealth and we hold a very important position and spending vast sums of money and I don't think we need to feel like we're captive, does that mean you can change it. That doesn't mean you can change it but also it doesn't mean we can't be independent, that we can't be citizen leaders. I don't think we should leave anyone off the table including who sits on committees and recommendations and whether you're involved in recommendations from your region. What I'm saying is that I commend the Chairman for putting us together and creating this committee and I think it takes a lot of courage on his part. I don't think we should take off the table anything including what the composition of

the Commission ought to be. We should think in the best interest of Southside and Southwest.

MR. ARTHUR: From the Southside Economic Development Committee standpoint, having been chairman for two sessions, I found that I've been able to say no to projects and won't even let them come to the table, whereas I found that some of the legislative members who have pressure on them and it comes back around if I've said no, then before the week's out, I get a call. We'll have a nice conversation and it may still be no. I think as a citizen member, that I do have the ability to say no without any pressure, other than maybe a couple of friends or acquaintances that are legislators.

MS. TERRY: That doesn't always happen. I had conversations with you and voiced that I disagreed with what we were doing, I might as well close the door because they've already got the votes and it's a done deal. The legislative causes went past every rule and went past every process on an issue and went right over.

MR. ARTHUR: Ms. Terry you're exactly right, you have to count the votes when they're there.

MS. TERRY: I'm saying that the legislators got together and they had enough on the committee to override all the rules and procedures. The question is, is that the way we want to, is that the culture we think is in the best interest of the Commission.

MR. ARTHUR: But Ms. Terry, how do you stop the lobbying that you're talking about, that's part of the process and if there's somebody that really wants something, I would talk to you about trying to get it done. That's lobbying I guess in a way.

MS. TERRY: That's the situation, it was a special meeting for a special purpose, no written report from the staff and the vote had already been among the legislators. So I guess that can happen. It's not hypothetical and it has happened. It's a question of, the legislators only constitute 11 members.

MR. CURRIN: The Governor or the Executive Branch has three direct appointees that are part of the administration. I give the devil its due. The Executive Branch can also play that role behind the scenes.

MS. TERRY: In terms of citizen members, citizen members are two-thirds of the Commission, 18. The citizen members may not feel impotent in this case.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, not just the legislators but you mentioned the lobbying and you got a powerful group and we got appointees and members sit on this board and it might be you, I'm not sure, and the Farm Bureau has someone.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Jenkins is with the Farm Bureau and he's their representative.

MR. WALKER: That's pretty powerful lobbying. They bring a project to the Commission and they twist their arm and get the thing done and if you vote against them, then they call your community and criticize you in the community. I don't appreciate that type of thing either.

MS. TERRY: In that situation we never relied on Virginia Tech. We never relied on the agriculture people at Virginia Tech to look at the project. We could have but I do agree with you.

MR. OWEN: The leadership of our committee structure except at the top and all the other committees that have money to spend have legislators as their chairperson. When you see those kind of appointments, anybody is going to say you've got classes of members. You've got the legislators in the leadership positions and dominate the Executive Committee and pull all the strings and then you've got the rest of us.

MR. CURRIN: I'll remind you and not to be sounding obvious, this is a

body created by the General Assembly of Virginia. In my opinion, if they really wanted it, they could have placed 10 or 11 legislators on it and not have citizen participation.

MS. TERRY: The General Assembly would never have gone along with that. I think that fair-minded people, the way they operate sometimes, it would not be a good thing for us because we're developing processes now, but no, the General Assembly would have never gone along with that. I agree with Claude the reality of the super class of members. There's nothing in the statute that creates any differentiation in terms of the responsibility or powers of the members. I've often wondered if it wouldn't be better if our office was in Roanoke. I think that's another thing that would contribute to the legislative centric organization of the Commission is that the office is located in Richmond where during critical times of the year, folks that have the most access to it are legislators.

MR. CURRIN: That's also good and bad. I agree with you. During this period of securitization, I can tell you one thing that it would have been a hindrance to not be close to all the different entities like the treasurer, the Attorney General's office and all these things that are here. Remember, they're only here two months out of the year and then they're not. We've done something about that by having regional offices in different parts of the state.

MS. TERRY: Think how this might be different if your office was in Roanoke.

MR. CURRIN: Roanoke's a great city.

MR. FIELDS: I think this whole committee here, if you just go around the table, there's not one in here today that's not wanting to say that there are too many committees or too many, I don't want to say pork barrel committees, too many of the distribution of money committees that are being chaired by the legislators. The only reason that I think that the Southside Economic got Tom to start with, I think they were all so afraid that they said let's put that on Tom Arthur, he's done an outstanding job with it. There are people around this table here today who can chair these committees.

MR. CURRIN: If I'm not mistaken, he was vice-chairman when Witt Clement and then he went to the Governor's Cabinet and the Chairman asked Tom to chair the committee.

MS. TERRY: We have people around the table that could chair the Commission. Every entity over time rotates the leadership and that's no reflection on the people. Senator Hawkins has done a terrific job but putting everything on the table and not just the structure but the shifting leadership issue I'd like to put on the table and moving the office to Roanoke which would be more centrally located and more accessible to the citizen members. I thought about that a lot and these different committees.

MR. FIELDS: I have something else too.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Fields, I'm not surprised.

MR. FIELDS: Let's go back to another issue and if we say one closing thing about these committees, there's not one of them I don't think, I don't think all committees should be chaired by legislators, I think we've talked about the very things here today that gives all the credence in the world to some of the special citizens. I want to talk and I let that get past me and we were talking about economic development. I don't want to speak for Southside so much because I don't know what they will do and what their real issues are on that and I don't want to skin your skunk. I think that's the way we say it in the mountains. I think the PDA's play such an important role in economic development. I'm no so sure what, they should come to the judging of the applications and so forth, maybe they shouldn't be judged without some EDA input into that and evidence of it. I hear a lot of crying and belly aching on the Commission that we're not regional

enough. They're not saying that often about the Southwest and we're not probably but the PDA's I think will make a real difference in helping the situation for both regions of being regional. They can help their applications I know plus, and I'm not even sure without those people having some input into it that we ought to think about it. I know the PDA boys back there probably don't like that idea of them playing an important role in that but I really feel that way. If a project comes to us that has the PDA input into it most of them are the kind of projects we would be looking for, wasting our time on the other ones.

MR. CURRIN: Like all organizations, some are stronger than others. Mr. Fields is correct that we have some very good PDAs that we work with. One of which is in Mr. Field's home area. Some of the others make their localities make the applications and they're not even a player. I've engaged them a little bit but I think that's different personalities involve different structures. It's a good concept and we encourage working with the PDAs. Some are stronger than others.

MS. TERRY: We have entities make applications within localities without ever asking the Board of Supervisors about it.

MR. CURRIN: That's been clear from you all that this is not money belonging to them.

MS. TERRY: But I'm saying much less the PDA.

MR. CURRIN: We're going to have non-profits, you're going to have Chambers of Commerce. Do they have to have a veto? Are you suggesting that?

MS. TERRY: No, I'm saying if we're getting input but I'm not suggesting veto. You're suggesting veto with the planning district?

MR. FIELDS: No, I don't think they want that either.

MS. TERRY: I'm just saying input.

MR. FIELDS: I think they could very easily say to someone it's not very regional, that's not very good. They're not going to approve this project the way it is, here's the problem and you're not leveraging any funds.

MR. CURRIN: On paper that sounds wonderful but in practice, you're going to have some PDAs are going to be a lot stronger and some are saying I don't want to deal with that. That's been our experience. That's something we can ask the Commission to adopt as policy that would be fine.

MR. FIELDS: Some find that to be better because it's very involved. In the Southwest right now we want to know.

MR. WALKER: Some of the PDAs are very effective and Britt down there used to work for one close to me. We had to start an economic development authority because the PDA was so weak in that area. We have some that are real good like yours and some to the south and east of us, some are weaker than others. It could be a hindrance too and you have to kind of give and take.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Any other comments?

MR. FIELDS: Yes, special projects. I would like to be clear. Can anyone on the special projects committee anytime they decide to meet, can they just bring an application to special projects?

MR. WALKER: That's at the discretion of the chairman.

MR. CURRIN: Are you asking when? If we get several or three or more requests, I'll alert the chairman that at some juncture before the next full Commission meeting given enough time for staff review and committee review and then we'll have a meeting. Currently it's not set. As I mentioned earlier, economic development had a set structure where we know in the springtime those grants will be awarded. Special projects is

anytime during the fiscal year.

MR. FIELDS: If I wanted a project, why would I make an application along with 50 more to be considered when I could make it in the special projects where maybe only four or five were?

MR. CURRIN: If it doesn't meet the special projects guidelines that are in place now, it doesn't meet it and it's referred to the appropriate committee. You asked the staff to try to be a policeman and direct that request to the right committee. That does not happen.

MS. TERRY: But those guidelines have just been put in place. Up until now, you're exactly right.

MR. CURRIN: If you look at the applications for the most part that has still been the case.

MR. WALKER: Even before the guidelines, a lot of time the Committee would send them back to agriculture or send them back to Southside Economic Development and they may have ended back up at special projects.

MR. FIELDS: Unless it's something that's just adamant or something that is so time sensitive that they should be in some other committee before they go to special projects unless it's very time sensitive. I don't think we should let General Motors leave and go to North Carolina because they haven't been to Southside Economic Development. I think that's a very precarious situation. I hope it is changed.

MR. CURRIN: It's in your packet, you all voted for them in October.

MS. TERRY: The guidelines that have the effect and they're probably good guidelines that were in effect the first four years will never find another boat. The effect of it is that the projects that were funded by special projects that localities benefited from, many of them will not be funded anymore so those of us that missed it, missed it. I was just following up on the committee meetings and I mentioned this before. I'd like to see us, particularly the committees not back up these meetings and stack them right before a major meeting. For example, we've got this Technology Committee meeting tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock and I talked to you over the holidays and the committee should be meeting a week before and there's potentially a number of things to deal with. I think that to set up a Technology Committee meeting with the agenda we've got at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning, another meeting is set for 9:30, we've got a Search Committee meeting at 9:30 but to allow a half an hour for the Technology Committee when we're bringing up and I had this conversation with you in December and have it again and I'm letting folks know, I think that's not fair to the committee.

MR. CURRIN: Sure.

MS. TERRY: What it means is that if there's any questions or issues that come up, they can't really be addressed because you've got to make a judgment right there and the Commission's train leaves in an hour. Back in Norton, those of you that didn't make that Technology Committee meeting, there was in that committee meeting a 180-degree reversal of what all of us agreed to at the meeting in Longwood. A 180 degrees reversal. I didn't know it before I walked into the meeting and I made reference earlier to a meeting violation of the Freedom of Information Act and I'm talking about the meeting held before that. There I was in a meeting that came right up against the full Commission meeting making a decision that involved all of Southside Technology with 180 degree change in direction that had been discussed among certain legislative members of the committee and asking repeatedly to go into Executive Session to find out what was going on. The committee structure really doesn't make any difference unless the committees are

the ones that make the decision. We're scheduling our committee meetings and we're stacking them in such a way that a lot of the work that ought to be done by the committee is being done by individuals. One of the key issues with technology had to do with the composition of that mid-Atlantic Board. One reason in technology that we had asked in Farmville for a proposal to come with a new board and we were concerned about that or concerned about the membership of the board and the concern was not raised by me. It was agreed by the committee that we would have input into the new board. I learned last week that things were being shopped by certain individuals that the composition of the board and the board would be selected by the Technology Committee. We can have committees all day long but if we don't make clear the prerogatives of the chair and prerogatives of the staff versus prerogatives of the members, we're still not going to be participating as a committee and I wanted to mention that. I wanted to caution that the Freedom of Information Act applies when three or more gather to discuss Commission business and that's as much a violation of the Tobacco Commission and it's happened and you all know it's happened as it is your Board of Supervisors. You play by the rules in your localities and we need to have a culture here at the Commission and play by the rules.

MR. WALKER: Can I change the focus here a minute?

MR. MONTGOMERY: Sure.

MR. WALKER: This has all been real good and we mentioned the revitalization. Can anybody tell us about indemnification and where we stand? A year ago we met down at VIR at the raceway and were given a presentation and the fact that we were on the threshold of the farmers not getting any more money. Then recently I was told we're just beginning to start paying. Can you simplify that for me, if you've got the United Way chart up there and the thermometer was going up.

MR. CURRIN: That's a moving target to answer your question Mr. Walker. There was another quota cut announced about a month ago which increases again our indemnification level. In a nutshell in the statute which you all have been given, it says how much the Commonwealth's Tobacco quota is worth. I guess our total response would be a billion two. That hasn't happened yet but there has been another quota cut and therefore our indemnification requirement is going to be about and I think Stephanie advised me a couple of weeks ago, around \$90 million dollars. That's now been added to the pot. Burley or flue cured. There's a lot of issues and potential legislation placed to go back to Congress to absolve and take out the tobacco quota system, federal buyout and altogether that may change what we in Phase I would have responsibility to indemnify. Remember that as a matter of policy, this Commission can decide how much indemnification it wants to put in its budget each year. You all can decide if you want to put in a dollar and that's all you put or a hundred million dollars, it's up to the Commission. We can indemnify for the next hundred years or you had the money next year. I can tell you that the current administration would like to see us put less than that amount or as much as possible and put most of the money in the other charge which is economic revitalization. From the staff's perspective, that's what I would recommend. Now we're here with a bunch of citizens and we also have tobacco growers here and we also have non-tobacco growers here. There's been issues about how much indemnification we should support. Southwest Virginia in the past four years, 80 percent of your money is going to indemnification, 80 percent, 20 percent economic development. Southside vast majority for indemnification or more of a parity. That's been a decision that's been basically decided between the two families, the golden leaf. Southwest has its view on that subject and Southside has its view on it. To cut to the chase Gary, there is still further indemnification that we're responsible for.

- MR. FIELDS: Carthan, we just finished '98 indemnification in burley. I don't think, flue cured is getting close.
- MR. CURRIN: Then you've got 1999 and you have to start applying the indemnification dollars, it's a moving target and it's kind of hard to focus on the various cuts and what that means.
- MR. WALKER: We're not talking just about our money but we're talking about phase I.
 - MR. CURRIN: I'm talking about just our money.
 - MR. FIELDS: Phase II or –
- MR. WALKER: \$12 and all the money whether phase I or phase II and somebody else gave you a buck on the street, when you got to \$12 you were through.
 - MR. FIELDS: That's what we're indemnifying to this day, 1998.
- MR. WALKER: The target is \$12, the pounds will move, the amount of pounds will move.
- MR. FIELDS: If you were cut 400 pounds in '98, you can indemnify for that but you took another cut in '99 of 360 pounds.
 - MR. MONTGOMERY: Where did the \$12 come in?
- MR. FIELDS: That's something we brought with us from the first time a buyout was ever mentioned.
 - MR. TAYLOR: Wasn't it \$8 for the quota holder and \$4 for the producer?
- MR. FIELDS: We never accepted it like that, we took it at \$12 per pound, the quota holder and grower.
- MR. TAYLOR: I thought we agreed on that 8 and 4 but never been between the quota holder and the producer.
- MR. WALKER: For assumptions sake, we all know it's not going to happen but just let's say that the federal legislation is passed for the buyout and for some reason they went back and took the 1999 foundation.
 - MR. CURRIN: We still have the obligation for 2000.
- MR. WALKER: If they took the '99 quota allotment and bought it out, I don't think they will, but if they did, we would be real close to being through.
 - MR. CURRIN: It would help a lot, yes.
- MR. OWEN: One caveat to that Gary, in the buyout, Phase II is gone and we might have to come back and -
- MR. CURRIN: We have said as a matter of policy we'd have to take that up.
 - MR. FIELDS: Other things having gone into that –
- MR. WALKER: I'm for helping the farmer but a year ago the presentation was that we needed to put a letter in saying that don't expect too much more.
- MR. FIELDS: TLAP is another thing. We included TLAP into that tobacco buyout. I want to make a correction Carthan. It's not a tobacco buyout anymore, it's a tobacco give away. Another 15 percent cut this year.
- MR. CURRIN: This chart speaks to the fact that if we securitized our money, we all decided as a matter of policy that this is what we'd put into the pot. The bulk of the money would go to revitalization. Even though we don't have securitized dollars, we have our annual flows. At least from a budgetary standpoint, when we create the budget we could accept what was recommended or delete or amend. I'm recommending you put fewer dollars in. There's nothing that says we have to. It could be a dollar or a hundred million dollars, that's a policy decision this body makes. There's nothing that says you have to do

more. Nobody knows the end of the road, it maybe 50 years to indemnify our entire obligation. It's frustrating because it's a moving target and kind of hard to get your hands around. Ultimately you all decide how much to put into it and no one else can alter that. Our recommendation and I know the secretary feels this way, that most of the money should go to these other issues on economic revitalization. As you all can recall in 2000 the decision was made to put 80 percent of our funds into indemnification over \$60 million from phase I alone went to indemnification. When you add phase II and the two TLAP payments, well over a hundred million in Southside and Southwest to quota holders and growers.

MR. OWENS: How much would the quota holder get per year?

MR. CURRIN: I don't have the exact figures. It varies but I can get you those figures. It varies in different years. It's also split differently in burley.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Could you mail that to the members?

MR. CURRIN: Yes.

MR. OWEN: It's about 50 million pounds and the budget is \$20 million or \$10 million dollars, it is different for Southside and Southwest.

MR. CURRIN: Troutman Sanders would have the updated figures. From 2000 on how much quota holders received in burley and also the flue cured area and the growers.

MR. ARTHUR: In researching something else this past week, I asked Troutman Sanders about this. In '98 if the farmer was farming a hundred acres of tobacco and now he would have about 50 acres. To date out of indemnification, we paid him \$147,000.

MR. CURRIN: That was the time that he was both quota holder and grower? MR. ARTHUR: That's right, quota holder and grower. If the farmer was a quota holder and the grower, we paid him \$147,000.

MR. CURRIN: When you add up all the figures from memory and from checks, we're talking about thousands of people and it probably averages \$5 or \$10 or \$12 thousand dollars and some as Mr. Arthur correctly points out, had more tobacco, they're going to get more money.

MR. MONTGOMERY: The average for Southside is higher than Southwest.

MR. STALLARD: It sounds when you give the percentages in the millions and it sounds a little different for flue cured than it does burley. Burley gets the smaller portion of the pot and I don't know if it's 20 percent or 27 percent and we have 37,000 payees. It would be interesting to see what the average burley check is.

MR. WALKER: If you did it per pound, you'd get a true figure.

MR. CURRIN: Typically what would an average burley grower, how much would he be raising in acreage.

MR. STALLARD: The majority of quota holders is a thousand pounds, 1,000 to 2,000 pounds, maybe he'd get a thousand or less. You've got a lot of people that get little checks \$200 or \$300 dollars.

MR. CURRIN: What's the average in Southside?

MR. OWEN: Forty acres.

MR. FIELDS: Some of them are so small they quit applying.

MR. STALLARD: There's a little confusion over burley versus flue cured, in burley you're helping a true poverty region. Talking about lessening the indemnification payments is almost absurd to me in burley. I think it's the best thing this Commission has done to get us out of a bind. Yes, I'd like to find something to do for my community but we've been looking for 15 years, every since smoking went out of style. Let's not forget

where the money comes from. We've given a lot of money to colleges which is great but you can't smoke within 100 yards of that college. They look down upon people who smoke that have given them the money. Let's keep in mind the smokers and the people that have worked on these tobacco farms. I know every state is different and I'm glad you're comparing North Carolina and Kentucky. Some of those people are really hurting. I know we talk about regionalization but let's look at who is actually hurting. Maybe the Commission ought to go to the tobacco farmers and see if this is really helping and touching those people who are down the most.

MR. FIELDS: They're not the only ones that get hurt. When the farmers are hurting up there, there's a whole lot of other people that are hurting and especially up in Nicholsville. The fertilizer dealers are hurting, equipment dealers, everybody gets hurt by that. Don't ever get it in your mind that every quota cut means there's little or no effect. If anyone would come out there, you'd see that a lot of people get hurt out of all of that.

MR. CURRIN: That's true.

MR. STALLARD: I agree we need to do things on a regional basis. I wish we could go to a tobacco farm and see who you're helping. Sometimes people are out of touch and these people, many of them are hurting. I wish we could do something to help.

MR. FIELDS: John, in addition to that farmer taking a cut, the whole community does in addition to that farmer because John Stallard doesn't have the money to spend at Johnny's Market, everybody gets hurt.

MR. FIELDS: Every quota that, don't get it in your mind that every quota cut means less of those little sticks of dynamite comes out of there, there's a lot of other people that get hurt out of all of that. The whole community and that's why this Commission was formed to start with because it only grows in the Southside and Southwest.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Are we about done today?

MR. FIELDS: I was going to make a motion that we stop right there until February 2nd.

MS. TERRY: I'd like to raise one other specific situation. We've talked about this and sometime back, sometime back I got a notice that the Executive Committee is going to go to Tech, I don't know, I guess it was bioinformatics and I don't know what that is and I think those types of things are very important. I wish I could have gone but there wasn't sufficient notice, it wasn't on the agenda with my plans. It was the Executive Committee.

MR. CURRIN: I take issue with how much notice you had Ms. Terry. Everybody on the Commission was notified to be there.

MS. TERRY: I understand but those types of meetings I think are important and they need to be prescheduled as part of the agenda, part of our annual agenda. First of all, I don't know why the Executive Committee would be going and not the Technology Committee would not have been going because it has to do with process.

MR. CURRIN: It certainly does Ms. Terry and at your first meeting as I recall when you joined the Commission over a year ago in Abingdon, I think Virginia Tech gave a presentation about bioinformatics and the very issues are on our website and it's been there for over a year. As far as that meeting goes, that was a meeting that was asked by Virginia Tech specific to the committee to have a joint meeting with their Virginia Bioinformatics Joint Committee. Rarely does the Executive Committee meet that often and it was an opportunity to notify at least an important committee of this Commission to talk about the process. I think the entire Commission was asked or told of this committee and everybody was there. We had other members, Mr. Moody was there, other members made

the decision to go.

MS. TERRY: Obviously, I hit a nerve Carthan and I didn't mean to –

MR. CURRIN: I get a little agitated with all due respect. I get a little agitated when things are directed to me and sometimes it seems a little personal and if you want to check the facts, let's check them all and see how much notice you had. I take issue with the fact that I'm not getting enough notice.

MS. TERRY: The issue has to do with process and setting time aside. It also has to do with who in this Commission would be the appropriate committee to meet with Virginia Tech on this issue. This Commission has made an enormous investment and I don't know how much other members know about it.

MR. CURRIN: I welcome the new director of Strategic Investments. I will delegate to him the ability to deal with this issue, Technology Committee, how's that? I just think with all respect to Ms. Terry, who I have a lot of respect for, I do my very best in this process and if we made a mistake I apologize. As far as the Executive Committee –

MR. MONTGOMERY: I don't think she was, have we got anything else to do today?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we adjourn.

MR. OWENS: I'll second it.

MR. MONTGOMERY: We're adjourned.

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED

CERTIFICATE OF THE COURT REPORTER

I, Medford W. Howard, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public for the State of Virginia at large, do hereby certify that I was the court reporter who took down and transcribed the proceedings of the Citizen/Outreach Committee meeting when held on Monday, January 12, 2004 at 2:00 p.m. at the Seventh and Franklin Building, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

I further certify this is a true and accurate transcript to the best of my ability to hear and understand the proceedings.

Given under my hand this 19th day of January 2004.

Medford W. Howard
Registered Professional Reporter
Notary Public for the State of Virginia at Large
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: October 31, 2006